

**David Halberstadter (CA 107033)**  
david.halberstadter@katten.com  
**Asena Baran (CA 342626)**  
asena.baran@katten.com  
**KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP**  
2121 Avenue of The Stars, Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3012  
Telephone: 310.788.4400  
Facsimile: 310.788.4471

**Christopher A. Cole** (*pro hac vice*)  
chris.cole@katten.com  
**Michael R. Justus** (*pro hac vice*)  
michael.justus@katten.com  
**KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP**  
1919 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20006-3404  
Telephone: 202.625.3500  
Facsimile: 202.298.7570

**Julia L. Mazur** (*pro hac vice*)  
julia.mazur@kattenlaw.com  
**KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP**  
525 West Monroe St.  
Chicago, IL 60661-3693  
Telephone: 312.902.5200  
Facsimile: 312.902.1061

*Attorneys for Plaintiff InSinkErator LLC*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION**

INSINKERATOR LLC, a Delaware  
limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

JONECA COMPANY, LLC, a Delaware  
limited liability company, and THE  
JONECA CORPORATION, a California  
corporation,

Defendants.

Case No.: 8:24-cv-02600-JVS-ADS

**PLAINTIFF INSINKERATOR  
LLC'S RESPONSE TO  
DEFENDANTS JONECA  
COMPANY LLC AND THE  
JONECA CORPORATION'S  
OBJECTIONS TO THE REBUTTAL  
DECLARATION OF WILLIAM R.  
EISENSTADT, PH.D.**

Date: January 6, 2025

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Place: 10C

Assigned to Hon. James V. Selna

Plaintiff InSinkErator LLC (“InSinkErator”) responds to portions Defendants Joneca Company, LLC and The Joneca Corporation’s (“Joneca”) Objections to the Rebuttal Declaration of William R. Eisenstadt, Ph.D. (“Eisenstadt Reb. Decl.”) (ECF 47–1), which Joneca filed in opposition to InSinkErator’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction (ECF 55), as set forth below.

## **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

Joneca’s objections to Dr. Eisenstadt’s statements in Paragraphs 5 (lines 9–10 only), 8–14, 19, 21–23, 38–40, and 42 of his declaration are meritless. Dr. Eisenstadt has established that his testimony is relevant, reliable, and reliable expert opinion. (*See* ECF 28, Declaration of William R. Eisenstadt (“Eisenstadt Orig. Decl.”).) His testimony sufficiently outlines his relevant knowledge, skill, experience, training, and education to make the conclusions therein; he explains the standards he considered to reach his conclusions; and his testimony proves that his conclusions are based on reliable principles and methods. This Court should therefore overrule Joneca’s objections.

## **II. ARGUMENT**

### **A. Relevant Legal Standards**

The relevant legal standards for expert testimony are as set forth in Plaintiff’s response to Defendants’ objections to Dr. Eisenstadt’s opening declaration, (ECF 44).

In addition, “[r]elevancy simply requires that the evidence logically advance a material aspect of the party’s case.” *Ruvalcaba-Garcia*, 923 F.3d at 1188. Evidence is relevant if it has “*any tendency* to make the existence of *any fact* that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.” Fed. R. Evid. 401 (emphasis added). This standard is a “low threshold.” *Brown v. DirecTV, LLC*, Case No. CV 13-1170-DMG, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 107244, \*21 (C.D. Cal.

May 19, 2022) (finding testimony “cross[ed] the low threshold of relevance.”) (quoting *Tennard v. Dretke*, 542 U.S. 274, 285 (2004)).

Within this legal framework, and contrary to Joneca’s arguments otherwise, Dr. Eisenstadt’s testimony is both relevant and reliable. This court should rely on the Eisenstadt Declaration when deciding the preliminary injunction motion.

**B. Dr. Eisenstadt’s Testimony Is Relevant.**

Although Joneca purports to make a “relevance inquiry” to assess whether Dr. Eisenstadt’s testimony is helpful to the trier of fact’s understanding of the issues (ECF 55 at 9), Joneca never actually assesses the relevance of Dr. Eisenstadt’s testimony per Rule 401. Instead, Joneca insists that Dr. Eisenstadt’s testimony is not helpful simply because it is contrary to the opinions of its own expert. Yet, baldly stating that Dr. Eisenstadt’s testimony is irrelevant because it is contradicted by the opposing party’s expert is insufficient to show that the testimony should be excluded. Joneca’s baseless conclusion should have no bearing on the Court’s analysis of whether that testimony has a tendency to make more probable or less probable the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action, per Rule 401. That Joneca’s expert has submitted contrary testimony on the same subject matter only demonstrates that Joneca understands Dr. Eisenstadt’s testimony is relevant, and thus its objection is disingenuous.

**C. Dr. Eisenstadt’s Testimony Is Reliable and Helpful.**

As explained in Plaintiff’s response to Defendants’ objections to Dr. Eisenstadt’s opening declaration, Dr. Eisenstadt has the necessary knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education to make his conclusions. (ECF 44.) Dr. Eisenstadt has specialized as “an expert in the field of electronic circuitry and in the design and testing of circuits for ignition systems and power electronics, including power integrated circuit design and testing” for 45 years, and has

1 “significant direct experience in power electronics and power systems, engine  
2 ignition systems and electric motors.” (Eisenstadt Orig. Decl. ¶¶ 1–3).

3 Dr. Eisenstadt testifies as to how his knowledge, skill, experience,  
4 training, and education qualifies him to opine about the proper standard for  
5 garbage disposal horsepower testing. Dr. Eisenstadt testified that: “Reviewing  
6 and understanding the specifications contained in standards requires basic  
7 engineering skills, and I am very experienced in doing so. I regularly use  
8 standards for my electronics work at the University of Florida.” (Eisenstadt Reb.  
9 Decl ¶ 6.) Plainly, he is sufficiently skilled to read and understand specifications  
10 and standards regarding electric motors.

11 Further, Dr. Eisenstadt analyzed how garbage disposals are marketed by  
12 retailers, retailers’ descriptions of horsepower, and advertising or buyers’ guides  
13 on garbage disposals. (*See* Eisenstadt Orig. Decl. ¶¶ 26–30.) He searched “the  
14 literature and found no relevant standards or reputable texts in which any  
15 engineer categorized the electric power input used by a motor for all purposes  
16 as its ‘horsepower.’” (Eisenstadt Reb. Decl ¶ 17.)

17 His conclusions are thus based on the relevant facts he reviewed and  
18 grounded in his expertise and years of research in the field. It is plainly helpful  
19 to the Court to hear an accurate summary of relevant scientific, engineering, and  
20 academic literature and standards and other research conducted by Dr.  
21 Eisenstadt within his long-established expertise.

### 22 **III. CONCLUSION**

23 InSinkEerator respectfully asks this Court to overrule Joneca’s objections  
24 to the Eisenstadt Rebuttal Declaration.

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 **KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP**

3 DATED: January 2, 2025

4 By: /s/ David Halberstadter  
David Halberstadter

5 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Katten**  
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2607  
+1 310 788 4400 Tel +1 310 788 4471 Fax

**L.R. 11-6.2. Certificate of Compliance**

The undersigned, counsel of record for Plaintiff InSinkErator LLC, certifies that this brief contains 808 words, which complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.1.

Respectfully submitted,

**KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP**

DATED: January 2, 2025

By: /s/ David Halberstadter  
David Halberstadter

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**Katten**  
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4601  
+1 310 788 4400 Tel +1 310 788 4471 Fax